

6930 E. Girard Ave., Apt. 110
Denver, CO 80224
Sept. 7, 2008

Mr. Stephen Cauffman
WTC Technical Information Repository
National Institute of Standards and Technology, Stop 8610
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-8610

Dear Mr. Cauffman:

I have read the instructions for submission of comments on the World Trade Center 7 Draft Reports, and to partially follow them, here is some of the required information: Name, Nancy M. Hall; Affiliation, U.S. citizen, retired; Contact, (303) 691-1971; Report number, NIST NCSTAR 1-9.

I realize my failure to cite page numbers, etc., will disqualify me from your considering the comments below, but I must offer them. Please read them. I've studied Dr. Frank R. Greening's response to the Reports; I agree with his conclusions. The fires were not widespread or hot enough to fatally damage the structural steel, and your description of the collapse doesn't jibe with the visual evidence.

In my childhood home, science was held in high regard. In 1877 my great-grandfather Asaph Hall, astronomer, discovered the moons of Mars at the U.S. Naval Observatory; and at Gallaudet College, Washington, DC, my father taught mathematics and my uncle, biology. My education in science was limited: I took a semester each of chemistry and physics in high school, and during my four years at Oberlin College, geology and geography. But most of the 250 books I read before my retirement from 10 years of freelance proofreading dealt with history, international politics, and science, and I've read the 9/11 literature extensively. I consider alleged facts carefully and critically, and give weight to common sense. So do not dismiss me out of hand for having believed for several years that WTC Building 7's collapse was a classic case of controlled demolition. It was a beautifully professional job: #7 came straight down, at very near free-fall speed, into its own footprint. Anyone watching the videos would immediately, rightfully conclude, *Demolition*. Thousands of reputable chemists, physicists, architectural engineers, and other scientists agree. Owner Larry Silverstein ordered, "Pull it!" David Ray Griffin's scholarly, heavily documented books are convincing. Have you and your colleagues read them?

Perhaps you've already studied the materials of the 9/11 Truth movement, now international in reach. I hope for an eventual new, fully independent investigation of what happened on and around 9/11. Meantime, cover-up of the truth continues in the U.S., and apparently NIST is planning to be complicit. Allowing a mere *three weeks* for comments on the Final Report on WTC 7 is a bad sign. I am assuming NIST has been under pressure by the Bush-Cheney administration to get it published before they're out of office. I can understand that NIST would comply; perhaps your jobs are at risk if you were to refuse. But if the Reports, produced at taxpayers' expense, contain deliberate falsehoods and reach wrong conclusions, you will not be serving the United States well. And someday when truth and justice prevail, as should happen in a democracy, you may wish you had balked. *Please, postpone publication!*

Sincerely,



Nancy M. Hall

✓ cc: at NIST, Dr. S. Shyam Sunder, Dr. James M. Turner, Dr. Richard Keyser, and Dr. Willie E. May